UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/889
28 July 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 28 JULY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ANGOLA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit the following letter from H.E. Mr. Venancio de Moura, Minister of External Relations of the Republic of Angola, with the request that it be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Afonso VAN-DUNEM "MBINDA"
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex

Letter dated 27 July 1994 from the Minister of External Relations of Angola addressed to the President of the Security Council

In the expectation that there will be a meeting of the Security Council to discuss Angola, previously scheduled for the end of the month, I thought it appropriate to write to you on behalf of the people and Government of Angola. I want to address aspects that appear to me to be fundamental to the correct understanding of the prevailing situation in Angola by members of the Council over which you preside. This action is being taken because I have verified that the information on which discussion of the Angolan question is being based (S/1994/865) contains a lack of detail and is written from a perspective that appears to ignore that a legitimate Government exists in Angola. It was democratically elected, and no one, under any circumstances, can demand that it relinquish responsibilities recognized within the purview of any Government.

This verification, although not new, has recently taken several worrisome turns. The Angolan Government considers particularly serious, for example, the fact that at the level of the United Nations, through the reports of the Secretary-General on the situation in Angola, an incomprehensible parallel has been established between the Government and the rebel forces of the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) - to say nothing of that between the aggrieved party and the aggressor.

We understand that the mediator role that the United Nations is undertaking in Lusaka in the process of searching for peace requires some balance in the efforts applied; but we have difficulty accepting that neutrality may be confused with partiality by not recognizing in an explicit and clear manner that the current Angolan conflict has a well-known cause and an identified responsible party - which is UNITA. This party should be treated always in accordance with the posture that brought it unanimous condemnation by the international community - reinforced with sanctions placed in effect by the Security Council in its resolution 864 (1993).

We must point out that distortions similar to those referred to above only satisfy UNITA's illegitimate aspirations and contribute to the prolonging of the war. This is because that organization continues to feel no real pressure to abandon its warlike objectives and arrogant behaviour at the Lusaka talks.

I would like to note that prior to arriving at this point in more or less productive talks, we undertook a long and arduous trek from Namibe (Angola), to Addis Ababa, and to Abidjan. The Government sought to bring an immediate end to the war, but there was no corresponding attitude on the part of UNITA. It merely took advantage of these events to deceive international public opinion and gain time to broaden and consolidate its military victories on the ground. It continued to seek to take power by force or the division of the country, a fact that happily was included in the report of the Secretary-General of 22 July 1994 (S/1994/865).

It is likewise important to emphasize that the participation of UNITA in the Lusaka negotiations did not happen so much because of its own volition as because of Security Council resolution 864 (1993) and other forms of pressure that did not leave it another alternative at the time.

In this regard, I am convinced that you will understand the importance of pressures on UNITA so that the negotiating process may reach a positive conclusion.

For this reason, the Angolan Government, which has the right to exercise plainly all inherent sovereign powers, will not permit UNITA's insurgency to continue indefinitely against established order and place the security of the country in danger, or against the lives of citizens and their possessions. Successive resolutions of the Security Council have reaffirmed this right of the Angolan Government.

In exercising this legitimate prerogative, one that cannot nor should not be questioned, the Government is trying to oblige UNITA to convince itself of the non-viability of its military strategy and of the necessity to assume in Lusaka a constructive position that safeguards the national unity and territorial integrity of the country and established democratic order.

We know that this is not the principle that UNITA is advocating, rather it is interested in maintaining indefinitely control of zones of the country that it occupied by force after the multiparty elections of September 1992. For this reason, it falsely manifests its support for a countrywide cease-fire outside a global agreement in Lusaka. It places this issue above all the problems that it invoked to justify the war; attempting to make unclear not only the negotiating process, but fundamentally the general situation in the country, where the Government, facing a status quo cease-fire would have great difficulty then avoiding a de facto division of the country.

It would be a terrible situation if such a division of Angola were to take place. From a domestic point of view, it would have more disastrous consequences than any other. Additionally, the consequences for southern Africa would be so serious that the Angolan Government and the United Nations must together try to coordinate a number of actions so that they do not inadvertently contribute to UNITA's game plan. This includes even those actions motivated by a concern over the humanitarian situation among the suffering populations in Angola.

I would like to point out that more than two thirds of the Angolan population live in areas under government control. A good part of these people fled from areas occupied by UNITA in search of security and assistance of all kinds.

The disruptions that have taken place in the transport of humanitarian aid are due singularly to the fact that UNITA, with the intention of using hunger as a political weapon, has conducted attacks against aircraft, vehicle convoys and other means utilized by humanitarian organizations based in Angola in the distribution of aid to areas under the control of the Government.

Unfortunately, the blame for these serious incidents provoked by UNITA is not ascribed to the known instigators in a clear manner in the report of the Secretary-General.

The Angolan Government defends the principle according to which humanitarian assistance should be taken to all Angolans independent of the location in which they find themselves. However, the Government cannot subordinate itself to restrictions imposed by UNITA when that organization says that Huambo and other areas it occupies are the only priorities.

Improvement of the humanitarian situation in Angola will be possible only with an end to war, and it only continues because negotiations in Lusaka have not yet reached a positive conclusion owing to the intransigence of UNITA. The flexibility demonstrated by the Government in accepting the suggestions of the mediators on broadening the participation of UNITA in all levels of the organs of State administration has not yet been reciprocated.

The Angolan Government is convinced that applying all types of pressure on UNITA will facilitate the search for a negotiated solution in Lusaka to the Angolan conflict.

The profound interest of the Angolan Government in re-establishing peace as quickly as possible compelled it to accept the diplomatic initiatives of the mediator and the observers that led to the involvement of President Mandela of South Africa, President Chiluba of Zambia and President Mobutu of Zaire in supporting the efforts of the mediation within the established negotiating framework.

The participation of these heads of State will be of benefit if they are capable of using their influence to bring Jonas Savimbi to cooperate with the mediation to accelerate the discussion and conclusion of the few points that remain on the Lusaka negotiating agenda.

Finally, the Angolan Government considers it strange that the report of the Secretary-General does not recommend the application of a second package of sanctions against UNITA. This action was established by the Security Council in resolution 932 (1994) should UNITA not respond in the affirmative by 31 July to the proposal of the mediation.

I request that this letter be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Venancio DE MOURA
Minister of Foreign Relations